



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/585,128

06/30/2006

Koichiro Tanaka

0756-7726

9907

31780

7590

06/03/2010

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.

3975 Fair Ridge Drive

Suite 20 North

Fairfax, VA 22033

EXAMINER

GARCIA, JOANNIE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2895

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/03/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/585,128	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TANAKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JOANNIE A. GARCIA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2895	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-23, 25-35 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 and 36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/30/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 14-37, in the reply filed on 01/22/2010 is acknowledged.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

**Claims 14-17, 25-29, and 37**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sasaki et al (US 2003/0216012 A1).

**Regarding claims 14 and 26**, Sasaki et al discloses a method for manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising forming a semiconductor film 36 over a substrate 12 (Figures 6 and 22, and Paragraphs 0069 and 0132), producing a first laser beam emitted from a laser oscillator 71 into a second laser beam by passing through a slit 76 (Figure 22, and Paragraph 0133), producing the second laser beam into a third laser beam by using a condensing lens 77 (Figure 22, and Paragraph 0133), irradiating the semiconductor film with the third laser beam, and moving the third laser beam relative to the semiconductor film (Figure 22, and Paragraphs 0018, and 0135-0137).

**Regarding claims 15 and 27**, Sasaki et al discloses a method for manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising forming a semiconductor film 36 over a substrate 12 (Figures 6 and 22, and Paragraphs 0069 and 0132), combining a first laser beam

Art Unit: 2895

emitted from a first laser oscillator 71 whose polarizing direction has been changed by a waveplate 78 with a second laser beam emitted from a second laser oscillator 72 by a polarizer 80, the combined laser beam serving as a third laser beam (Figure 22 and Paragraphs 0132 and 0134), producing the third laser beam into a fourth laser beam by passing through a slit 76 (Figure 22, and Paragraph 0133), producing the fourth laser beam into a fifth laser beam by using a condensing lens 77 (Figure 22, and Paragraph 0133), irradiating the semiconductor film with the fifth laser beam, and moving the fifth laser beam relative to the semiconductor film (Paragraphs 018, and 0135-0137).

**Regarding claims 16 and 28**, Sasaki et al discloses that the condensing lens is a convex spherical lens (Paragraph 0133).

**Regarding claims 17 and 29**, Sasaki et al discloses that the laser beam is a continuous wave laser beam (Paragraph 0132).

**Regarding claims 25 and 37**, Sasaki et al discloses that an image at the slit and an image on the irradiation surface are in a conjugated relation by the condensing lens (Figure 22, and Paragraph 0132-0134).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 18-23, and 30-35**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al (US 2003/0216012 A1), as applied to **claims 14-17, 25-29, and 37**, above, and further in view of Tanaka et al (US 2003/0086182 A1), Sawada et al (US 2006/0138102 A1), and the following comments.

**Regarding claims 18, 21, 22, 30 and 33**, Sasaki et al does not teach that the laser beam is emitted from a YAG laser, YVO<sub>4</sub> laser, YAlO<sub>3</sub> laser, an alexandrite laser, a Ti:sapphire laser, an Ar gas laser, or a Kr gas laser, with a repetition rate of more than 10 MHz. Tanaka et al discloses a laser beam emitted from a YAG laser, YVO<sub>4</sub> laser, YAlO<sub>3</sub> laser, an alexandrite laser, a Ti:sapphire laser, an Ar gas laser, or a Kr gas laser (Paragraphs 0018, 0023, 0027, 0106, 0109, and 0110). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sasaki et al and Tanaka et al, to enable the laser beam 71 and 72 of Sasaki et al to be performed, according to the teachings of Tanaka et al, because in such a process the method of Tanaka et al would be used according to its disclosed intended purpose and would therefore have reasonably been expected by one of ordinary skill in the art to yield the predictable results of achieving the laser beams 71 and 72 of Sasaki et al, and also, it would improve crystallinity (See Tanaka et al, Paragraph 0011).

**Regarding claims 19, 20, 31 and 32**, Sasaki et al does not teach that the laser beam has a pulse width in femtoseconds, and that the laser beams is a Ti:sapphire laser. Sawada et al discloses a laser beam having a pulse width in femtoseconds, and that the laser beams is a Ti:sapphire laser (Paragraphs 0008, 0048, and 0058). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sasaki

Art Unit: 2895

et al and Sawada et al, to enable the laser beam 71 and 72 of Sasaki et al to be performed, according to the teachings of Tanaka et al, because in such a process the method of Sawada et al would be used according to its disclosed intended purpose and would therefor have reasonably been expected by one of ordinary skill in the art to yield the predictable results of achieving the laser beams 71 and 72 of Sasaki et al, and also, it would provide a suitable method for processing small parts such as those for a micromachine (See Sawada et al, Paragraph 0058).

**Regarding claims 23 and 35**, Sasaki et al discloses the claimed invention except for a width of a microcrystal region to a laser irradiation region formed by the laser irradiation apparatus ranges from 1 to 20  $\mu\text{m}$ . It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable width for the microcrystal region in the process of Sasaki et al to be performed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

In addition, the selection of the suitable width, it's obvious because it is a matter of determining optimum process conditions by routine experimentation with a limited number of species of result effective variables. These claims are prima facie obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges or a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they

Art Unit: 2895

produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill or art) and *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1995) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed suitable width, or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability it's said to be based upon particular chosen suitable widths, or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen suitable widths, are critical. *In re Woodruf*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

**Claim 24 and 36** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joannie García, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, N. Drew Richards, can be reached on (571) 272-1736. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/N. Drew Richards/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2895

/JAG/  
May 22, 2010

DRichards  
SPE